

SUPERVISORY SELECTION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A REPORT WITH CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE AS A RESULT OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE PERSONNEL NEEDS AND PRACTICES OF THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES BEING CONDUCTED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 53, AS AMENDED BY SENATE RESOLUTIONS 206 AND 288, WITH THE PURPOSE OF FORMULATING POLICIES FOR THE MOST EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DURING THE PERIOD OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY



JULY 4 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

NNETH McKELLAR, Tennessee
 TTHEW M. NEELY West Virginia
 IN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island
 KE MONRONEY, Oklahoma
 ORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida
 OMAS R. UNDERWOOD, Kentucky

South Carolina, *Chairman*
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
JAMES H. DUFF, Pennsylvania
WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah
FRED A. SEATON, Nebraska

THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina, Chairman

MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma
KENNETH McKELLAR, Tennessee
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

MELVIN PURVIS, *Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary.....	1
I. Description of project.....	4
II. Brief description of informal programs.....	5
III. Brief description of formal programs.....	7
IV. Problems in unplanned programs.....	8
V. Problems in planned programs.....	13
VI. Civil Service Commission and private industry.....	15
VII. Conclusion.....	16
VIII. Recommendations.....	18
Appendixes:	
A. Detailed description of Navy program.	
B. Detailed description of program in Bureau of Accounts, Department of the Treasury.	
C. Detailed description of proposed program for Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.	
D. Detailed description of program in Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Federal Security Agency, Baltimore, Md.	
E. Air Force directives on supervisory selection.	

CONTENTS

1	Summary
2	I. Description of project
3	II. Brief description of national program
4	III. Brief description of national program
5	IV. Problems in national program
6	V. Problems in national program
7	VI. First stages of the national program
8	VII. Conclusion
9	VIII. Bibliography
10	Appendix
11	A. Detailed description of the program
12	B. Detailed description of the program in terms of the program
13	C. Detailed description of the program in terms of the program
14	D. Detailed description of the program in terms of the program
15	E. Detailed description of the program in terms of the program

SUPERVISORY SELECTION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

JULY 4 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following

REPORT

[Pursuant to S. Res. 53]

The Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies was authorized and directed by Senate Resolution 53, approved February 19, 1951, to conduct a study into the manpower and personnel policies and practices of the Federal Government with a view to the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel during the period of the national emergency.

This report embodies the findings and recommendations resulting from the subcommittee's comprehensive study in the field of supervisory selection.

SUMMARY

I. A vital problem area in manpower utilization is supervision. Supervision is management; that aspect of management that comes into direct and constant contact with labor; that aspect of management that trains, directs, and gets out the work.

The duties of a supervisor have undergone radical changes in the last 20 years. He is now a leader of men, not a repressive instrument of management. His performance will be an indication of his success; and his success will determine the quality of production and efficiency.

The importance of good supervision in effective manpower utilization has been recognized by leaders in government and industry. On January 11, 1952, Chairman Robert R. Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission, reiterating his belief that supervision is the key to effective manpower utilization, said:

Better government can be obtained through better management. Better management requires assumption of greater personnel responsibility on the part of every official and supervisor.

In my opinion, criticism of time-consuming procedures required to oust incompetent and undesirable employees has been due in large part to the fact that

too many supervisors in government have been merely "drifting with the tide" and not providing the positive and aggressive kind of leadership to which the taxpayer is entitled.

The responsibility for better management is a personal one. Those in supervisory positions cannot escape it * * *.

II. The Federal Government is not obtaining the best available personnel for supervisory positions because the following factors emphasized in selection are such that supervisory potential is frequently overlooked:

1. Technical proficiency of supervisory candidates is stressed to the detriment of leadership qualities and ability to get along with people. "The practice of promoting the best workers to supervisory positions has proved disastrous in many instances. The experience of both private business and governmental organizations has demonstrated that technical skill in many supervisory positions is less important than the ability to lead employees."¹ The established fact that the best work producer need not be the best supervisor has been disregarded.

2. Seniority has been unduly emphasized. This limits the number of candidates with high supervisory potential, deters men of ability from remaining in the organization, and makes it virtually impossible to uncover obscure candidates.

3. Supervisors tend to be chosen without full and adequate consideration inasmuch as there is no reservoir of potential supervisors from which to choose when a vacancy occurs. The logical result is a lag in production and efficiency.

4. Organizational lines are seldom crossed. There is a tendency to fill a supervisory vacancy from within the particular section in which the vacancy occurs. The area of competition is thus substantially narrowed; this, in turn, narrows the field of applicants from which selection may be made.

5. Undue emphasis has been placed on personal knowledge of a candidate by the selectors to the detriment of those less well known. There is a lack of procedural method to determine ability of candidates not personally known.

The problems outlined above exist in those agencies which do not have a planned selection program. The Civil Service Commission has informed this subcommittee that they are aware of only nine Government agencies which are using systematic supervisory selection programs that meet the following criterion as set forth in the Commission's manual on selecting supervisors.

1. Determination by management of minimum qualifications and area of competition.

2. Invitation to all employees who meet these minimum qualifications to compete. However, one has to recognize that some employees may not compete because they feel that there is a "fair haired boy" who will be selected no matter what selection methods are used. Therefore, it is incumbent upon those managing the program to make certain that every effort is made to inform employees about the objectivity of the program.

3. Administration of written tests to the employees who have indicated their willingness to compete.

¹ Guide for Planning Supervisory Development in Federal Agencies. Published by Civil Service Commission, September 1951.

4. Evaluation of personality characteristics, in addition to the use of the written tests mentioned above, by means of interviews and vouchers.

5. Review of work histories.

6. A systematic analysis of all the data obtained and determination as to who is to be considered successful and who is not.

7. Finally, a determination as to which employee best meets the particular needs of each job as it arises.

Only one of the nine listed—Civil Service Commission—has an agency-wide program. Most of the programs are limited to one or more of the organizational components within the agency.

III. The Division of Accounting Operations, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Federal Security Agency, is one of the few Government organizations that has a planned program for selecting supervisors. Before supervisors are selected the following procedures must be observed:

1. Written evaluation of the candidate by his immediate supervisor.

2. Analysis of this evaluation and summary of the candidate's personnel file by the Personnel Office.

3. Preliminary oral interview by a rotating three-man committee which judges the candidate independently of any prior evaluation.

4. Ability and personality tests designed only to weed out obvious misfits.

5. Final interview and ultimate selection is made by a panel committee composed of representatives from personnel, top management, and middle management.

6. Those selected are given a formal supervisory training course. Upon completion they become members of a reservoir from which operating heads fill first-line supervisory vacancies.

Planned programs are not a panacea in the field of selection and no one Government-wide program is suitable for selecting supervisors. Planned programs, however, can be designed to meet the needs of the individual organizations. The purpose of a planned program is not to foist upon the operating people a candidate they might not desire; rather, it is to give operating people the widest possible group of qualified personnel from which to make a selection. Furthermore, morale problems are reduced because all candidates feel that their abilities have been objectively evaluated. Flexibility will be preserved at all times. This is the philosophy of the systems now in operation in several Government agencies.

IV. The Civil Service Commission—the logical place in Government for further developing systematic selection processes—is severely limited in terms of manpower from instituting a coordinated program with the individual departments. At present, two man-years per year are devoted to all Government departments; 0.75 to one man-year is devoted exclusively to the Department of the Navy on a reimbursable basis.

V. Our recommendations are embodied in S. 3493, Eighty-second Congress, a bill to provide for greater economy in the use of manpower, money, and materials by the development of more effective methods for selecting supervisory personnel in the Government service. This bill, introduced by Senator Olin D. Johnston, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies, places responsibility with the various agencies and departments, in cooperation with the Civil

Service Commission, for the initiation of planned selection programs which will conform to the principles outlined in the legislation. The bill further provides that the Civil Service Commission shall secure from the agencies and transmit to the Congress, within 6 months of the date of enactment, a report concerning the progress achieved in each of the agencies.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON SELECTION OF SUPERVISORS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

For the purposes of this report it is important to note the distinction between supervisors and administrators. An administrator might be defined as one who spends at least 50 percent of his time on program planning and coordination. Supervisors, on the other hand, are responsible for work performance. This report deals solely with selection of supervisors. Emphasis has been placed on the first-line supervisor rather than the higher levels of supervision.

There are three problem areas that must be considered in selecting supervisors:

- (1) Methods and techniques used in the selection process.
- (2) Training after selection.
- (3) Effective leadership and participation by top management in the program.

This report deals with only one area, namely, methods of selection. However, that in no way minimizes the importance of the remaining two methods. Without proper training the best procedures for selecting supervisors will avail nothing. And unless there is effective and enthusiastic participation by management in the selection process, advanced techniques cannot insure the procurement of better supervisors.

Procuring the best possible supervisors has always been a major problem in private industry as well as the Federal Government. There is widespread acceptance of the belief that "An important part in conserving manpower is played by the provision of good supervisors throughout the Government. This means both good selection and good training."² From the time of the Korean emergency the problem of selection has increased in importance.

Proceeding on the thesis, then, that good supervision is an essential factor in obtaining high production and efficiency, we intend to show, by this report, what the methods of selection are in the Federal Government and whether those methods adequately satisfy the need for obtaining the best possible men for supervisory positions. We have not restricted our interests to selection only from present Federal employees since we recognize that circumstances sometimes require outside recruitment. As an integral part of the study, general and specific problems relating to the project will be listed and illustrated by data collected through our investigation.

² Letter of September 4, 1951, from Robert Ramspeck, Chairman, Civil Service Commission, to heads of departments and independent establishments.

II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF INFORMAL PROGRAMS NOW IN OPERATION

A. Securities and Exchange Commission

The Securities and Exchange Commission utilizes the understudy method in selecting supervisors. Employees with at least the minimum qualifications for a supervisory position are given an opportunity to fill in for the supervisor during his temporary absences. When a vacancy occurs, the bureau chief, in cooperation with the Personnel Director, makes the selection from this group.

B. Civil Aeronautics Board

Almost without exception the Civil Aeronautics Board's supervisors are chosen from within the organization. This results from the organization's practice of employing understudies—each supervisor has an assistant. A candidate for a supervisory post must show some evidence of supervisory experience.

C. Federal Communications Commission

The Federal Communications Commission has no formal policy for selection of supervisory personnel. The main factors in selecting supervisors, after appropriate recommendations from the bureau chief and clearance from the personnel office, are the candidate's general reputation and how well he is known to the Commissioners.

D. Interstate Commerce Commission

The Interstate Commerce Commission has no program for selecting supervisors. Promotion is from within. Selections are made by the operating heads. The practice is to have an understudy for each supervisory position. Seniority seems to play an important part in selection process. Organizational lines are seldom crossed in selecting a supervisor because, according to Interstate Commerce Commission officials, the work of each bureau is too technical and highly specialized.

E. The Department of Labor

The Department of Labor has no formalized program for the selection of supervisors. For the lower level supervisory posts the selection is made by the operating official involved. The area of competition for such positions is, whenever possible, limited to the unit in which the vacancy exists. If the vacancy is in a higher level of supervision the area of competition is broadened and the selection is subject to the approval of the Bureau head and the Personnel Director.

F. Veterans' Administration

The Veterans' Administration has a formal program for selecting managers and assistant managers for field stations. Present branch managers are requested to submit recommendations. The Personnel Department reviews work records of those recommended. The evaluation of the candidate's work record accounts for 70 percent of his total score. A committee of three, two Assistant Administrators and the Medical Director, then interview the candidates. They rate them on their over-all capabilities (20 percent) and personality (10 percent). A register is then established to aid the Administrator in selecting managers and assistant managers when vacancies occur.

Although the Administrator is not bound by the list, he has filled each of the 173 vacancies which have occurred since the program's inception from the top three names on the register.

The Veterans' Administration has no formal program for selecting lower-level supervisors. Supervisors at division level and above are selected by operating heads subject to the approval of the Assistant Administrator. Those selections below the division level require no approval.

G. Department of the Army

The Department of the Army has no uniform method for selecting supervisors. The Civilian Personnel Division, Office of the Secretary of the Army, issues only broad policy statements on the subject. The procedures which have been adopted by the various organizational divisions within the Army vary greatly. Several Army field installations have requested and been supplied with material for supervisory selection by the Civil Service Commission. In certain of the Army arsenals highly formalized selection systems are in existence, while in other installations selection is completely delegated to the operating official involved. The Civilian Personnel Division is now in the process of collecting information on the formal plans in current use in the Army with a view toward developing a selection program suitable for Army-wide application.

H. Department of the Air Force

At this writing the subcommittee has not had an opportunity to study the selection methods used by the Department of the Air Force. We are informed, however, that the Air Force, in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, has recently developed and validated a battery of psychological tests to be used in the selection of supervisors. A copy of directives which have been issued to all Air Force field installations governing the use of test materials appears in appendix E of this report.

I. Department of the Navy

See the outline of formal program for selection of IV-A (blue-collar) supervisors.

Although several field installations have formal procedures for the selection of 4B (white-collar) supervisors, Navy has no such program on the departmental level. The departmental personnel office has issued only broad policy statements on the subject. Each bureau has its own method of selecting supervisors. Examples:

Bureau of Ships.—The Bureau of Ships has a semiformal supervisory selection program. When a vacancy exists the Personnel Office supplies the operating head with the personnel jackets of eligibles within the Bureau. The operating head makes the final selections and he is in no way bound to select from the list supplied him.

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.—The Bureau has a selection program in semioperation. The program contemplates the establishment of a promotion register and the institution of a supervisory training program. When the program is in full operation a review of the register will be mandatory before candidates from outside the Bureau may be considered. It is hoped that the training program will result in a pool of trained supervisors being available to fill vacancies as they occur.

At present, according to the Personnel Director, selection of supervisors is confined to promotion of understudies. If the understudy method fails a search is conducted branch-wide, then division-wide and, if necessary, bureau-wide.

III. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF FORMAL PROGRAMS

A. Department of the Navy IV-A (blue-collar) program for selection

The Navy Department program for the selection of supervisors of blue-collar workers, the largest of its kind in the world, is more than 30 years old. It includes 5 levels of supervision from leading men through master in more than 100 different trades in more than 600 field establishments. Approximately 15,000 supervisory positions are included within this program.

The components of this program are as follows:

(1) Announcement of the examination so that all employees are aware of the opportunities and so that everyone knows the methods for selection to be used.

(2) Minimum qualifications in order to insure that the employees being considered have a background in the same field as the work they will supervise and also be persons with the same general social background as those they will supervise.

(3) A written test consisting of 65 questions containing two types of items: First, supervisory judgment which attempts to measure understanding of relationships with other people, including superiors, colleagues, and subordinates, and understanding of the personnel responsibilities of the supervisor, including his duties in the area of the full utilization of employees, their training, the rating of their performance, and other aspects of personnel management; and secondly, 20 questions on reading comprehension to test the ability to interpret what one reads.

(4) The fourth part of the program is an evaluation of the training and experience record of the individual. This is supplemented by a written evaluation of the aptitude and job performance submitted by several superiors on a special rating blank prepared only for the purposes of examination.

(5) The fifth and final selection method is the interview, either the typical individual type, or the group oral performance test. The interview is mandatory for chief quartermen, foremen, and masters; it is discretionary with the installation at the leadingman-quartermen level. The results of these steps are summated in one final score and the top three persons on the list are considered for each vacancy.

B. Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Division of Accounting Operations, Federal Security Agency, Baltimore

(1) Twice a year first-line supervisors are requested to complete a supervisory aptitude evaluation form on their employees.

(2) These forms are sent to the section chief who analyzes them and forwards to the personnel office those which he feels are ready for supervisory training. Personnel reviews the files on those recommended and briefs their records.

(3) Candidates are interviewed by a panel consisting of two section chiefs and a representative from the personnel office. The group oral interview technique is employed. The candidates appear in

groups of four and are asked to discuss a topic suggested by the panel. The panel members then observe the candidates in the ensuing discussion. Panel members have no information on the candidates before them. They evaluate the employees on a standard rating form. The panel members then discuss their individual evaluations and arrive at a common evaluation for each interviewee. This is an attempt to obtain a second and independent evaluation of the employee's supervisory aptitudes.

(4) General ability tests and personality tests are administered to all candidates. The test results are used to supplement the supervisory and panel evaluations and are never used as a sole basis to justify the inclusion or exclusion of any candidate.

(5) A selection panel consisting of the nine branch chiefs, advised by the assistant division chief and three representatives from the personnel office now narrow the candidates to the desired number. This is accomplished by a review of the personnel records, supervisors' evaluation form, individual panel members' evaluation, panel summary evaluation, and test results. The candidates that remain are enrolled in supervisory training classes.

(6) Supervisory training classes meet for 2 hours per week, three times a week. The training is continued for a 5-month period.

The above program provides a pool of trained personnel from which first-line supervisory posts are filled.

The planned programs outlined above are similar to those in current use at the Civil Service Commission, two bureaus in the Department of the Treasury, the Rural Electrification Administration, certain Army installations, and several other governmental organizations.

IV. LIST OF PROBLEMS IN UNPLANNED PROGRAMS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS AS ILLUSTRATED BY DATA COLLECTED THROUGH INVESTIGATION

A. General problems in supervisory selection

(1) There is general agreement that a major qualification for a supervisory position should be a marked ability to get along well with people. A problem arises in determining the degree to which a candidate possesses this quality and the weight that should be assigned to it in relation to technical proficiency. Examples:

(a) A military officer and his civilian assistant in a tabulating division within one of the defense departments stated that technical proficiency is now the sole criterion in selecting supervisors in their organization. They both feel that a method similar to the Navy's program for selecting 4-A supervisors would work very well in their divisions. Neither man was familiar with the Navy procedure prior to our interview.

(b) The director of personnel in another department expressed the opinion that technical competence was probably the controlling factor in selecting lower-level supervisors.

(c) In a defense establishment a supervisor was asked to recommend a man for an existing vacancy in a key supervisory position. He chose an employee in his section despite the fact that he (the supervisor) knew that the man "had the unfortunate habit of antagonizing people." Regardless of his shortcomings this employee is "the heir to the throne" on the basis of his

superior technical ability. (The supervisor's evaluation of the man's personality was borne out by the result of a supervisory attitude test devised by the Civil Service Commission—his score makes him a questionable selection.)

(2) The question of how much weight should be given to seniority and the effect of seniority on both the thinking of those doing the selecting and the candidates being selected is a perennial issue. Placing undue weight on seniority limits the number of candidates with high supervisory potentialities, deters men of ability from seeking employment or remaining in the employ of such an organization, and makes it virtually impossible to uncover obscure candidates.

Although almost all operating personnel interviewed denied that seniority is a major factor in selecting supervisors, the practice of promoting the next in line indicates that it is relied upon heavily. Examples:

(a) One bureau personnel director in a defense department described the situation in his organization as follows: Even though there are formal plans for the future, at present the selection of supervisors is primarily confined to the promotion of understudies who arrive at this position by seniority. If the understudy is not satisfactory then selection is made on as broad a basis as is possible, with seniority generally disregarded.

(b) A branch head in a defense agency stated that seniority plays too great a part in supervisory selection within his organization. The emphasis, in his opinion, stems from the thinking of the employees. A section head in the same agency feels that past performance and seniority are key factors in supervisory selection.

(c) The director of personnel in one independent agency stated that the "seniority rule" is strictly observed in his agency. According to this individual, the junior man is chosen for a low-level supervisory post only when the senior man does not wish to assume the additional responsibilities. A check of the promotion register substantiated this statement. During a 2-month period in 1951 there were 28 promotions to positions at GS-5 and above. With two exceptions, the senior employee was promoted in each case. In fact, there was but one actual exception—in one instance the junior employee was selected only after the senior person declined the promotion.

A GS-3 clerk formerly with the same agency gave the following reasons for his resignation. "A person had to wait for someone to retire before he could expect a promotion. Seniority is greatly emphasized."

As opposed to the above, in the various Navy field stations seniority is a relatively minor factor in selection. It is possible for one to become a candidate for a first-line supervisory position a week after employment.

(3) Supervisors tend to be chosen without full and adequate consideration inasmuch as there is no reservoir of potential supervisors from which to choose when a vacancy occurs. The logical result is a lag in production and efficiency.

Several Government agencies are not faced with this problem since they have understudy programs. The understudy assumes the duties of his superior when a vacancy occurs. However, this is to be differentiated from having a pool of trained supervisors from which a selection may be made.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department are only a few of the governmental organizations which lack a reservoir of trained supervisors. The Veterans' Administration has a pool only in its branch manager program.

(a) In an interview with a high-level official in a defense department, it was disclosed that the present policy for selecting supervisors varies from one bureau to another. The departmental personnel office has issued only broad policy statements to the bureau personnel offices.

One of the major shortcomings, according to this official, is a lack of planning. Little thought is given to the problem of developing a pool of potential supervisors. Since the work must go on, the man next in line usually gets the job.

(b) In one defense establishment a vacancy occurred in a GS-11 supervisory position. The vacancy lasted for a period of 10 months because there wasn't a sufficient reservoir of supervisors from which to choose.

The planned programs of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Federal Security Agency, in Baltimore, and the Navy field installations are designed to provide a pool of supervisors to fill openings as they occur.

(4) There is a tendency to fill a supervisory vacancy from within the particular section in which that vacancy occurs. Crossing division, branch, section, and even unit lines is avoided whenever possible. The area of competition is thus substantially narrowed; this, in turn, narrows the field of applicants from which selection may be made.

It must be noted that there are situations in which such a restriction is a necessity. It would be foolish to permit a carpenter to compete for a supervisory machinist's position or an accountant, without further qualifications, to become a candidate for the post of general counsel. However, the restrictions do not always go off on this rationale. Examples:

(a) A branch head in a defense department informed the subcommittee that he selects from within the section, if possible, on the basis of observation of on-the-job performance. It is rare that sectional lines are crossed.

(b) Another branch head in the same department stated that the list of names supplied by personnel as candidates for a supervisory vacancy was of no value to him since all supervisory selections that he had made were from within his own branch. He made these selections on the basis of ability, willingness, and seniority.

(c) In a letter to the chief counsel of this subcommittee, the Personnel Director of the Department of Labor said: "For lower level supervisory vacancies, selection is made, where possible, from among the employees in the unit where the vacancy has occurred." An Assistant Administrator in the same Department disclosed that selection for such positions is confined to the unit involved unless a candidate from outside the unit possesses "outstanding" qualifications.

(d) When asked how he would choose his successor, one high-level supervisor in a defense establishment indicated that consideration would be restricted to those presently employed in his section.

(e) In the Interstate Commerce Commission each bureau is practically autonomous resulting in a selection policy that seldom crosscuts organizational lines. We were informed that lines are not crossed because the work of each bureau is too technical and highly specialized. There are approximately 1,800 employees in the Interstate Commerce Commission divided among 15 bureaus.

(f) A former employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission had the following comment on the Commission's selection procedures: "They will not cross organizational lines. If you are good at one job, they will not promote you because they don't want to lose you."

In contrast to the above, in the Division of Accounts, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in Baltimore, there are 4,800 low-level employees in various technical specialties. Competition for first-line supervisory position, however, is open to all employees.

(5) There are instances in which undue emphasis is placed on personal knowledge of a candidate by the selectors to the detriment of newcomers and others less well known. Knowledge of a man's high ability certainly should be a point in his favor; but there is generally a lack of procedural method to determine ability of candidates not personally known. This problem area of choosing the known over the unknown, despite whatever shortcomings the former might have, is a logical result of an unplanned selection technique. Examples:

(a) In one independent agency it was admitted that the main factors in selection of supervisors, after appropriate recommendation from the bureau chief and clearance from personnel, are the candidate's general reputation and "how well he is known to the Commissioners."

(b) One official interviewed cited the problem of pressures from outside his department. He stated that telephone calls and letters from Congressmen and other individuals are received when a vacancy occurs. This often places the department in the embarrassing position of having to explain why the person recommended was not selected. While a formalized selection procedure would not eliminate this problem entirely, it would, perhaps, aid the department materially in justifying a choice based on objective standards.

(c) In commenting on this problem a supervisor working under the selection plan in operation at the Division of Accounting Operations in Baltimore made the following statement:

The appeal this policy has to the majority of employees is the fact that it is a Division policy, that promotions or selections are Division-wide and not restricted only to areas in which they are known. The former methods were constantly subjected to criticism as unfair; that all one needed was "pull," "know the right guys," and be friendly with the boss. Undoubtedly such attitudes may have been responsible for some of the new and more ambitious employees leaving the Administration. The present method only requires a certain degree of efficiency on the part of each eligible individual to be met and one automatically is accorded the first step of recognition; namely, an evaluation form is prepared.

(d) In referring to the formal selection program in the United States Patent Office, Mr. Sam Kingsley, personnel officer, made the following observation:

This method is a marked improvement over previous selection methods in that the selections are more objective, personal prejudice and favoritism are eliminated, and seniority is a factor only when other qualifications are equal.

(e) In assessing the benefits derived from a formal supervisory selection program in operation at the various installations of Standard Oil of New Jersey, Mr. Edwin R. Henry of the employee relations department, made the following statement:

We believe that one of the greatest benefits of the program has been the identification of potential supervisors who would not have been made thus known in any other way. This is particularly true of the individual who is doing an exceptionally good job on his present assignment and, since he gets in no trouble, seldom is called to the attention of higher level supervisors. It is also true of those individuals who work pretty much in isolation without a great deal of contact with supervisors other than their immediate foreman.

All agencies which utilize an understudy program or which place great stress on personal observation are, of course, in danger of failing to give fair consideration to those candidates of whom they have no personal knowledge. This generalization applies in some degree to all of the departments which do not have a planned selection program.

(6) Any method of selection, planned or unplanned, will create a serious morale problem unless employees feel that their abilities were at least considered.

A case in point is the method utilized in selecting a GS-5 supervisor in one of the defense establishments. He was a product of the technique of spotting "bright looking" young men in the corridors. This does not mean that ipso facto he is not qualified for the position he now occupies. Such a method of selection would, however, generate the impression among those in the selector's work force that they were not given fair consideration before the selection was made. The mere fact that a highly subjective technique was utilized would tend to create a morale problem.

In the various field stations of the Navy, on the other hand, every man meeting the minimum qualifications is assured of an opportunity to participate in a competitive examination and, in addition, to have his work record objectively reviewed and evaluated. The formal programs in existence in the field stations do create their own problems. This, however, is not one of them.

In a letter to the Chief of the Office of Industrial Relations, Washington, D. C., from the United States naval ordnance plant in Indianapolis, dated July 25, 1951, it was recognized that—

As a result of tests used for promotional purposes to IV-a positions, unusual talent has been discovered and it is believed that the promotional examination is not only a good indicator of the best qualified personnel for the job but builds morale and acts as an incentive for the lower grade IV-a personnel and the artisans to continually improve themselves in skill and in knowledge of the job.

The Personnel Director of the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts realizes the effect on morale that an unplanned method of selection will produce. There are plans to create a promotion register of qualified employees. Selection in the future will not be made until all the candidates on the register are seriously considered.

In one agency the promotion policy requires that all vacancies be advertised agency-wide. Despite this, in many cases selection has been predetermined by an operating official. The employees then requested Personnel to list the name of any candidate who had an inside track on the job when notices of vacancies were posted. The obvious purpose behind the request was to eliminate a waste of employees' time and effort in submitting an application and being interviewed for a position where the candidate had already been chosen prior to any selection procedure. The result now is that the predetermined heir apparent has no competition. His preselection automatically eliminates the field. The selection procedure becomes a farce and, in effect, the position is won by default.

B. Conclusions

Our investigation has disclosed that there is no uniform method of selecting supervisors within the Federal Government or even within the bureaus of the departments visited. Methods vary from the most formalized system as illustrated by Navy's program for blue-collar supervisors to the most informal system as illustrated by the technique of interviewing a "bright looking" young man spotted in the corridor. In many cases division, branch, section, or even unit lines are seldom crossed in selecting supervisors. There have been situations where seniority has been overemphasized and the "heir apparent to the throne" virtually automatically promoted. Technical competence has been stressed to the detriment of administrative ability. A problem of morale is created when the method of selection does not insure workers that their abilities were at least considered. In one independent agency the factor of how well known the candidate is to the commissioner is of major importance. Finally, there has been no provision for creating a reservoir of potential supervisors so that vacancies may be filled promptly.

V. LIST OF PROBLEMS IN PLANNED PROGRAMS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS AS ILLUSTRATED BY DATA COLLECTED THROUGH INVESTIGATION

The impression might be gained from what has been stated thus far that the planned programs represent a panacea in the field of selection. This is most definitely not the case. Even though many of the problem areas that exist in unplanned programs have been successfully solved in most instances, there are conflicts that are created with the establishment of planned programs.

The following problems exist in one navy yard which utilizes a planned technique for selection of supervisors:

A. Failure of supervisors serving in a contingent capacity to pass the written examination

In 1950, at this navy yard, 76 contingent leadingmen and quartermen were examined and 21 failed to obtain a passing score. In 1951, 110 were examined and 49 failed; the percentage of contingents that failed (44.5) was greater than the total percentage of failures among all those who took the examination (32 percent). As a result of the policy governing examinations the contingent supervisors will be replaced from among those who were successful on the examination and who meet all other qualifications.

The problem, then, is at least twofold: (1) How valid is the test when a greater percentage of supervisors than employees fail? (2) What will be the effect on morale when the contingent supervisors return to their shops as workers to be supervised by an employee formerly responsible to them? That is, how much cooperation can the new supervisors expect and to what degree will their authority be undermined?

By way of explanation of this result, the employment superintendent at the yard is of the opinion that this is due to the large number of contingents who were serving in trades such as painter, calker and chipper, shipwright, laborer, and one or two similar groups. "It appears to me that the competitor from these trades, who would naturally be less capable of handling theoretical questions and paper work, is at somewhat of a disadvantage in taking the exact same written tests as, for example, the electrician, machinist, or electronics mechanic."

B. Lack of information about specific aspects of the program

(1) Supervisory candidates are rated on the basis of a written test (questions on shop supervision and administration) which is assigned a weight of 40 percent, and ability, experience, and fitness (rated on the basis of applicant's efficiency and personnel jacket record) which is assigned a weight of 60 percent. However, the men in the yard do not know the breakdown of the 60-percent figure—that is, it is not analyzed so that the candidates know how they were graded on each of the components.

(2) Publication of the register of eligibles. After each candidate has been graded, a register of eligibles is established ranking those candidates who have achieved a passing score. Since the register is not published the men do not know their own standing and that of other candidates. This situation results in widespread rumors and general misinformation. The cases cited to our investigator as indicating an abuse of the system were largely the result of erroneous information. Examples: (1) An individual was cited as a case where the rule of three was violated (selection from the first three names on the register and so on down to the next three). Actually, when this person's name came up for consideration he personally requested that he not be considered for appointment. (2) In another case the information given the investigator was that a certain worker failed the leadingman's test in 1950; yet he ranked No. 1 on the quartermen's (a higher level supervisor) list in 1951. The facts were that this employee did not take the examination in 1950.

The above situation has been partially remedied by the practice adopted this year of including a candidate's numerical standing on the register with the test results that are sent him individually.

C. Final ratings have been delayed

Although the 1951 examination was conducted in June, final grades were not distributed until January 1952. The employment superintendent stated that this 6-month period of uncertainty could be reduced at least 50 percent by the industrial relations staff working overtime on a few Saturdays.

D. No oral interview is given leadingmen and quartermen

Officials of the yard contend that the large number of candidates for these positions would make oral interviewing cumbersome and

time-consuming. However, the desire for an oral interview was expressed at every level of management by union representatives and by the workers themselves.

E. Trial period for newly selected supervisors

The trial period in the Navy program provides:

Any person promoted as a result of this examination will be required to demonstrate competence in the position to which promoted by successful on-the-job performance for 1 year following the effective date of such promotion. Any person who fails to demonstrate suitability for retention at the higher level may be reduced to the same position, grade, and salary from which promoted, if the position still exists provided that such reduction or demotion shall not be made until after full and fair trial of not less than 90 days.

Whatever value the trial period may have had was partially eliminated when the Civil Service Commission ruled that veterans were entitled to the procedural safeguards under the Veterans' Preference Act before demotion. The value was then completely obliterated when the Navy extended this ruling to nonveterans.

It should be noted that although the Navy selection program for blue-collar supervisors is mandatory, the various installations are given a great deal of latitude in the administration of the program. With the exceptions of problems (A) and (E) above, the problems are primarily internal ones of administration.

VI. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The Civil Service Commission—the logical place in Government for further developing systematic selection processes—is severely limited in terms of manpower from instituting a coordinated program with the individual departments. At present, two man-years per year are devoted to this vital management problem. Of the two man-years devoted to all Government departments, 0.75 to 1 man-year is devoted specifically to the Department of the Navy on a reimbursable basis. Despite the need for expanding its activities in this field, the Civil Service Commission has accomplished a great deal with its present staff. An excerpt from a report on the Commission's activities illustrates what has been accomplished:

Research work: First and second level supervisors of skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled tradesmen, clerks, and engineers have been included in the research work we have done in the field of supervisory selection. The most extensive of this research work has been with blue-collar supervisors in Navy field establishments. This research work up to the present time has included more than 1,000 supervisors in seven Navy field establishments of different types. This research work is probably the most extensive that has ever been conducted on this subject. The tests developed in our work with the Navy have been made available to the Department of the Air Force and their research work has validated our research work. We also have made one of these tests available to the Aluminum Co. of Canada and the State of Michigan. The data supplied by those organizations have furnished us additional assurance of the validity of our approach.

In the clerical supervisory field, our work has been more limited and has included two studies, one at the Bureau of Census and one at the Bureau of Accounts of the Treasury Department. Both of these organizations are now using the results of this research work, as well as other organizations.

One group of engineer supervisors at the GS-12 and GS-13 levels has been studied at the Bureau of Ships. The results obtained by the Bureau have led them to use the recommended selection methods on a regular basis.

Despite the extensive research work which has been done with blue-collar supervisors, the development of new selection methods has led us to continue our research work with these groups. In addition, efforts are being made to obtain other types of supervisors for inclusion in research studies.

In addition to our own research work, we consider it our responsibility to keep abreast of developments in private industry, universities, and foreign countries. We have interchanged materials with all of these groups in order to make certain that our program reflects the best thinking throughout the world.

Some of America's largest and most progressive corporations have spent a great deal of money and time to improve procedures for selection in the field of supervision. An excellent indication of what private industry has accomplished is set out in a pamphlet entitled "Training of Supervisors" by the Anglo-American Council on Productivity. The council, composed of a group of British industrialists, made a study of American industry from February 13 to March 30, 1951. The council found that—

the main lesson of American practice is to be found not so much in details of procedures as in the general importance placed on systematic selection and the open-minded and innovating attitude shown.³

Despite the keen cost-consciousness of all the large companies visited, substantial sums of money were being spent. Faced with the problem of selection:

many American managements have reacted with characteristic energy and have been ready to try out thoroughly all available methods and techniques which might help in solving it. In simplified terms, therefore, the current trend is away from traditional methods of ad hoc nomination to fill supervisory vacancies as they occur (or the system of "mull and muddle" or "catch as catch can," as the past practices of two firms were described to us), and toward the adoption of various forms of "systematic" selection and promotion procedure. These may include a forecast of future supervisory vacancies; job analysis and job specification; the completion of history sheets; some form of merit rating or assessment of all available personnel (from the point of view of potential supervisory ability); the use of a battery of psychological tests covering intelligence and special aptitudes and also certain personality characteristics; careful interviews by more than one assessor; the appointment of a standing or ad hoc committee to make final recommendations; and, in a few cases, prepromotional training used as a final stage in the selection process. In fact, a methodical, and sometimes scientific, approach is now being made to a problem which has usually in the past been treated as a matter of "common sense," "hunch," or traditional practice. Some of these techniques may have their dangers; as one American told us, "I don't know whether I am more frightened by the type of manager who claims that he never makes a mistake in judging a man, or the one who thinks that a battery of tests gives an infallible answer."⁴

The findings of the Anglo-American Council on Productivity were based on a survey covering 35 American companies.

VII. CONCLUSION

No one Government-wide program is suitable for selecting supervisors. Planned programs, however, can be designed to meet the needs of the individual organizations. The purpose of a planned program is not to foist upon the operating people a candidate they might not desire; rather it is to give operating people the widest possible group of qualified personnel from which to make a selection. Flexibility will be preserved at all times. This is the philosophy of the systems now in operation in several Government agencies.

Planned programs generally use psychological tests as a factor in selection. In the various Navy field stations it is relied upon heavily; in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in Baltimore, it is of limited importance. A planned program, however, need not use

³ P. 1.

⁴ Pp. 13-14.

testing at all. If some of the agencies visited would merely establish a selection committee to obtain multiple judgment on candidates, one step in the right direction would have been achieved.

The planned programs of supervisory selection, though by no means perfect, afford a better opportunity for insuring selection of higher grade supervisors.

Until perfect ways of measuring ability are devised, some misfits will slip through any selection screen. But even a wide-meshed net will catch more fish than bare-handed grabbing. * * * Supervisory potential isn't always self-evident for several reasons: (1) Because of the lack of relationship between the duties of non-supervisory and supervisory positions, the rating of performance in a non-supervisory position, unless carefully done, can be misleading in terms of selection for a supervisory position; (2) some individuals are more aggressive than others and hence are better known to those who fill the supervisory vacancies; (3) newcomers to a particular unit may be overlooked in favor of those with greater length of service in the unit; (4) the area of competition tends to be restricted to the immediate unit in which the vacancy exists. A systematic selection program will spotlight talent obscured by one or another of the above factors.⁵

It seems significant that in the course of our investigation we have not found one instance where a governmental organization has adopted a planned selection program and subsequently reverted to informal selection. Those which have planned methods are enthusiastic about the results they have achieved. An excerpt from a letter written by Mr. J. L. Fay, Assistant Director of the Division of Accounting Operations, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Federal Security Agency, illustrates this enthusiasm.

All personnel and operational officials are firmly convinced that our present method for selecting and training supervisors has definitely increased the caliber of supervision. Our conclusions are based on several factors. The cost of operations, despite salary increases, a decrease in the number of hours worked per week, and increases in the costs of supplies, has consistently decreased while the workload had consistently gone up. In the period from 1940 through 1950, the number of wage items processed, our largest job, increased by 38.2 percent, yet in the same period the number of man-years required for processing one million wage items decreased from 32.2 in 1940 to 24 in 1950, a decrease of 25.5 percent. In handling claims actions in our accounting operations, there was an increase in workload of 163.5 percent for this period. Yet the number of man-years per thousand claims actions has decreased from 8.9 to 3.5, a decrease of 60.7 percent in clerk time.

All of our workloads have increased during this period. In the major operations over a 10-year period, workloads increased from 58.4 percent up to 628 percent, the mean increase being roughly almost 200 percent. Nevertheless, the number of people required to perform all operations increased by only 119, there being 4,326 people in the Division in 1940, and 4,447 at the end of 1950.

The fact that we have increased our efficiency to such a degree that we can handle such a large increase in workloads with about the same number of people is due to several factors. These include improved methods, more efficient mechanical equipment, program maturity, and improved supervision. We have made no objective studies to show how much is directly attributable to the improvement in supervision, but we are convinced that it has played as great a part as any of the other major factors. Our personnel and operating staffs are also convinced that the improved supervision is the direct result of the present selection and training program for first-line supervisors, and that it has also contributed to the general improvement of over-all management.

Under the method followed by us, supervisors are more appropriately selected in terms of skills and abilities. Technical competence in a particular operating field does not have the controlling weight in selection that was formerly the case. More attention is given to social skills and aptitudes. Further, the selection process is division-wide. By taking selectees from the entire division and giving

⁵ Selecting Supervisors, published by the Civil Service Commission, 1951, pp. 2-3.

them identical training and placing them in any area where supervisors are needed, we are assured that the supervisors have a greater over-all knowledge of the entire job performed by the Division. Under this method of selection a person does not have to try to figure out what branch or section would seem to offer the greatest opportunity to him for advancement. He knows that selections for training and for placement in supervisory work are on a Division-wide basis. He knows that even though he is working in a small organizational segment, with practically no supervisory turn-over, his opportunities for selection for training, and for placement as a supervisor are just as good as those of anyone else anywhere in the Division.

These facts have been evidenced in many ways. The counseling office and the interviewers in personnel now receive far fewer complaints with respect to supervision and the present complaints are, for the most part, related to misunderstanding of personnel management policies and regulations rather than complaints against individual supervisors. The line officers of the Division have made the same observation. Employees and supervisors alike have stated voluntarily that complaints and misunderstandings can now, in almost all cases, be handled by discussion with the first-line supervisor. As an example of this, we might cite the uninvited expression from a nonsupervisory employee at a meeting of employees held several months ago on another subject. This person suggested that today there was no reason to have a committee of employees from within the Division to present problems and grievances to management, because now our supervisors were capable and could satisfactorily handle all items of this type. * * *

There is an overwhelming need for the Civil Service Commission to expand its activities in the field of supervisory selection. The Commission, in cooperation with the various Government departments, should continue to work toward creating a planned supervisory selection program that will result in the individual departments procuring the best possible talent to fill their supervisory positions. Good supervision is a key to effective manpower utilization and the opportunity for obtaining better supervision is broadened by a planned program of selection.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations are embodied in S. 3493, Eighty-second Congress, a bill to provide for greater economy in the use of manpower, money, and materials by the development of more effective methods for selecting supervisory personnel in the Government service. This bill, introduced by Senator Olin D. Johnston, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies, places responsibility with the various agencies and departments, in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, for the initiation of planned selection programs which will conform to the principles outlined in the legislation. The bill further provides that the Civil Service Commission shall secure from the agencies and transmit to the Congress, within 6 months of the date of enactment, a report concerning the progress achieved in each of the agencies.

[S. 3493, 82d Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To provide for greater economy in the use of manpower, money, and materials by the development of more effective methods for selecting supervisory personnel in the Government service

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby declares that the interests of efficiency and economy in the performance of the authorized functions of the Government would best be served by the establishment of planned methods and procedures for the selection of personnel for supervisory positions which will—

(a) provide that the supervisory selection program shall be stated in writing and made available to all employees;

- (b) provide for establishment of minimum qualifications for each supervisory position;
- (c) provide the widest practicable areas of competition;
- (d) emphasize supervisory ability as well as technical skill;
- (e) provide suitable methods for evaluating supervisory potential or past supervisory success; and
- (f) furnish appointing officials with a reasonable number of eligibles from which to make appointments.

SEC. 2. Immediately upon the enactment of this Act the head of each department and independent agency in the executive branch of the Government is authorized and directed to review the methods currently employed in the selection of supervisory personnel within his respective agency. In any case in which the head of any such department or agency determines pursuant to such review that such methods do not meet the standards set forth in the first section of this Act, he is authorized and directed, with the technical assistance of the Civil Service Commission, to take such action as may be necessary to establish methods and procedures which will comply with such standards.

SEC. 3. The Civil Service Commission shall secure from the agencies and transmit to the Congress within six months of the date of enactment of this Act, a report concerning the progress achieved under this Act in each of the departments and agencies.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A.—DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF NAVY PROGRAM

NAVY PROGRAM FOR SELECTING BLUE COLLAR SUPERVISORS

Issued: 11 May 1951.

Announcement No. 2-1-5 (1951)

Closing date: 24 May 1951.

(Assembled)

I. ANNOUNCEMENT

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ANNOUNCES COMPETITIVE PROMOTION EXAMINATION FOR LEADINGMAN AND QUARTERMAN POSITIONS AT THE NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD FOR THE OCCUPATIONS LISTED BELOW

Automotive mechanic	Mechanic (material laboratory)
Blacksmith (other fires)	Mechanic, power plant
Blocker and bracer	Millman
Boatbuilder	Molder
Boiler maker	Operator, high-lift truck
Calker and chipper (iron)	Optical instrument maker
Carpenter	Ordnanceman
Chauffeur	Packer
Chauffeur (heavy duty)	Painter
Coppersmith	Patternmaker
Craneman, electric	Pipecover and insulator
Die sinker	Pipefitter
Driller	Public works
Electrician	Radio mechanic
Electrician, power plant	Refrigeration and air-condition mechanic
Electronics mechanic	Rigger
Elevator mechanic	Roofer
Engineman	Sailmaker
Engineman (H. and P.)	Sandblaster
Engineman, locomotive	Sewer
Flangeturner	Sheetmetal worker
Forger, drop	Ship maintenance mechanic
Gas cutter or burner	Shipfitter
Instrument maker	Shipwright
Joiner	Stevedore
Laborer	Toolmaker
Laborer, cleaner	Toolroom mechanic
Letterer and grainer	Track laborer
Locksmith	Transportation
Loftsman	Typewriter repairman
Machinist	Welder, electric
Mason, brick or stone	Welder, gas
Mechanic, fire control	

Salary: See item No. 3

Applications must be on file with the recorder, Board of United States Civil Service Examiners, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., not later than May 24, 1951.

1. This examination is announced for the purpose of filling vacancies in the positions named above. Vacancies in other positions which may occur at the naval shipyard requiring similar qualifications may be filled from this examination.

In accordance with existing civil service regulations, promotions made as a result of this examination will be indefinite. Eligibles not presently having a competitive civil service status will not attain such status as a result of this examination.

2. Who may apply

Applications will be accepted from employees of the New York Naval Shipyard, Bayonne and Maspeth annexes, and the naval industrial reserve shipyards at Port Newark and Kearny, N. J., who are serving under permanent or indefinite appointments, who meet the experience requirements specified.

3. Rate of pay

Appointment will normally be made at the first step rate of the leadingman or quartermen pay scale which is determined as follows: Leadingman: Third step hourly pay rate of trade plus 30 cents calculated on a per annum basis. Quartermen: Third step hourly pay rate of trade plus 55 cents calculated on a per annum basis.

The rate of compensation for the special supervisory ratings of leadingman and quartermen, mechanic, power plant; mechanic (material laboratory); transportation; and public works is fixed upon the hourly third step pay rate of that group III rating which is most nearly representative of the over-all function of the shop or department.

4. Duties

Quartermen positions: Under the general direction of a foreman or chief quartermen, and normally working through subordinate supervisors (leadingmen), he is responsible for the selection and assignment of individual journeymen to work under the supervision of his leadingmen subordinates and for assuring that adequate personnel are assigned to complete production in conformity with assigned schedules; he is responsible for indicating to each leadingman under his supervision the work for which his group is responsible and of the completion schedules involved. He must apply a broad knowledge and understanding of the principles of the Navy's program of personnel administration including leave, pay, efficiency ratings, safety, training, grievances, reductions in force, veteran preference, employee services, and the like, and must perform his assignments in full understanding of sound leadership principles. As may be necessary, he supplements the on-the-job instruction of his subordinate leadingman in order to assure that workmen will be able to perform efficiently; will be responsible for making whatever additional examinations of completed work he may feel are required to assure the meeting of prescribed standards, and to perform such additional supervisory duties as may be administratively assigned to him by higher levels of supervision; in the accomplishment of his responsibilities, to present such problems as are beyond his authority or responsibility promptly and clearly to higher supervisory levels for consideration and solution.

Leadingman positions: Under the general direction and supervision of a quartermen or higher supervisory authority, to be responsible for the immediate supervision of artisan level employees in the appropriate shop at this activity. He is required to work directly with the men at the location of the job, where his duties will include the assignment of tasks to workmen, and the "on-the-spot" instruction of such workmen in job methods and techniques. He must become familiar with the fundamental rules and regulations involved in the administration of the Navy's personnel program including safety, training, leave, pay, efficiency ratings, grievances, reduction in force, veteran preference, employee services, and the like, and must understand the rudiments of leadership. Within the limit of his authority, he is responsible to see that necessary materials and equipment are provided on the job; determines that work performed by subordinates meets the required standards, and is responsible for meeting the established work completion schedules and such additional immediate supervisory duties as may be assigned to him (such as assigning efficiency ratings, granting leave, and recommending promotions).

5. Experience required

For leadingman positions applicants must have had at least 2 years of progressively responsible and successful experience as a journeyman in the apprenticeable trade for which application is made, or 2 years of progressively responsible and successful experience in the nonapprenticeable occupation for which application is made at a level of responsibility fully comparable to journeyman in an apprenticeable trade.

The above experience must have been such as to demonstrate complete familiarity with the trades and/or skilled occupations involved, related shop practices, and the responsibilities of a leadingman as set forth above.

For quartermen positions applicants, in addition to meeting the experience requirements for leadingman, must have had at least 1 year of responsible and

successful experience in the rating of leadingman in the trade or skilled occupation for which application is made or in a supervisory position in private industry in the same occupation at a level of responsibility not less than that of leadingman in a naval field establishment.

The above experience must have been such as to demonstrate complete familiarity with the trade and/or skilled occupations involved, related shop practices, and also ability to perform technical and administrative duties as outlined above.

Substitutive qualification for quartermen positions: For leadingman experience: In lieu of the 1 year of required experience at leadingman level, there may be substituted any one of the qualifications specified under (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e), as follows:

(a) One year of experience as a planner and estimator or progressman pertinent to the trade or skilled occupation for which application is made.

(b) Two years of professional engineering experience at GS-7 level pertinent to the trade or skilled occupation for which application is made.

(c) One year of professional engineering experience at GS-9 level pertinent to the trade or skilled occupation for which application is made.

(d) One year of experience as assistant shop superintendent at GS-7 level pertinent to the trade or skilled occupation for which application is made.

(e) Any time equivalent combination of two or more of the qualifications specified under (a), (b), (c), or (d) above.

6. Efficiency

In addition to meeting the experience requirements, all applicants must have a performance rating of not less than "Satisfactory" under the performance rating system.

7. Basis of rating.

Competitors will be rated on the subjects listed below, which will have the relative weights indicated. This is a competitive promotion examination and no additional credits are allowed for veterans preference.

<i>Subjects</i>	<i>Weights</i>
(1) Written test (questions on shop supervision and administration)-----	40
(2) Supervisory ability, experience, and fitness (to be rated on the basis of applicant's efficiency and personnel jacket record)-----	60
Total-----	100

8. Ratings required

All competitors must attain an eligible rating of not less than 70 in each of the subjects listed above. Competitors who fail to make at least 70 in part (1) will not be rated on part (2).

9. Registers and certification

Separate registers of eligibles will be established for each trade or occupation within each shop or department. Eligibles will generally be certified only from the list for the trade and shop in which they are employed. Selections will be made in accordance with the civil service rule of three whereby any one of the top three eligibles who are available may be appointed. Planners and estimators, progressmen, and others not presently assigned to a shop will be certified from lists for the trade and shop in which last employed.

10. How to apply

Obtain application card Form 5000—AB from the Recorder, Board of United States Civil Service Examiners, Building No. 14, New York Naval Shipyard; from the Director, Second, United States Civil Service Region, Federal Building, Christopher Street, New York, 14, N. Y.; or from your shop personnel supervisor. Fill the card out completely (including shipyard identification number). Be sure to state the exact title or titles of the trade or occupation for which you are applying.

In addition, planners and estimators, progressmen and others not presently assigned to shops, should indicate after the trade designation the shop for which application is being made.

11. Where to file

Applicants must send the application card form to the Recorder, Board of United States Civil Service Examiners, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn 1, N. Y.

12. Admission to the written test

Applicants will be notified by card of admission, of the time and place of the written examination. The card of admission must be presented to the examiner on the day of examination.

13. Trial period

Any person promoted as a result of this examination will be required to demonstrate competence in the position to which promoted by successful on-the-job performance for 1 year following the effective date of such promotion. Any person who fails to demonstrate suitability for retention at the higher level may be reduced to the same position, grade, and salary from which promoted, if the position still exists, provided that such reduction or demotion shall not be made until after full and fair trial of not less than 90 days.

14. Expiration of registers

All registers for these positions previously established will be expired upon the establishment of registers of eligibles as a result of this examination.

RECORDER, BOARD OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS,
New York Naval Shipyard, Naval Base, Brooklyn 1, N. Y.

II. RATING SCHEDULE—COMPETITIVE PROMOTION EXAMINATION, LEADINGMAN, QUARTERMAN

See announcement for minimum requirements and subject weights.

The announcement states that:

Subject I (written test) has a weight of 40.

Subject II (supervisory ability, experience and fitness) a weight of 60.

Scoring for subject I is obtained by taking 40 percent of the score earned in the written test (pt. I).

Scoring for subject II is determined as follows:

Step I

Take 52 percent of the experience rating as determined by the following schedules:

Quartermen:

A. First year as leadingman	70
B. Additional experience (not to exceed 10 years for (1) and (2):	
(1) 3 points for each year at quartermen level or higher	} maximum----- 30
(2) 1½ points for each year at leadingman level	
(3) Bonus points for Chief Quartermen level or higher, 2 points for each year (maximum 8 years)	16
	<u>116</u>

Leadingman:

A. First 2 years as journeyman	70
B. Apprentice graduate	3
C. Additional experience (not to exceed 9 years for (1) and (2):	
(1) 3 points for each year as leadingman level or higher	} maximum----- 27
(2) 1½ points for each year at journey- man level	
(3) Bonus points for quartermen level or higher, 2 points for each year (maximum 8 years)	16
	<u>116</u>

Step II

To the score obtained from taking 52 percent of the experience rating add the score obtained from voucher rating determined by the following schedule:

Vouchers will be sent to immediate supervisors of applicant.

Vouchers will request immediate supervisors of the applicant to indicate their opinion of the applicants' suitability as a potential supervisor according to the following scale:

Above average

Average

Below average

Three vouchers will be sent for each applicant provided each applicant has worked under the supervision of three supervisors.

Vouchers which indicate lack of knowledge on the part of the supervisor of which show only short periods of supervision (1 month or less) will be considered incompetent vouchers and will not be considered in the scoring.

The chart below represents in each column according to the number of competent vouchers received the value in whole percentage points of each voucher. Scoring is accomplished by adding the values for the number of competent vouchers received.

Vouchers	Above average	Average	Below average
3 vouchers.....	2.67	1.87	0
2 vouchers.....	4.00	2.80	0
1 voucher.....	8.00	5.60	0

Step III

Reduce the score obtained by the above summation by the following values where review of the applicants personnel jacket indicates penalties which reflect on his suitability as a supervisor.

Personnel jackets to be reviewed from (4 years prior to closing date of the examination) to the date of rating.

Only penalties officially recorded as of the date of rating will be considered.

Deductions to be made as follows by whole percentage points:

1 point for each official warning.

2 points for each day of suspension (whether or not deferred).

20 points for demotion or removal for cause or for discharge from private employment for unsatisfactory service.

Deductible penalties as listed above which have not been officially recorded as of the date of rating and which are recorded prior to the date of certification may be considered under objections if the consideration of such penalties would have resulted in an ineligible rating at the time of original rating.

Use of schedule—quarterman

Illustration 1: Applicant obtains a score of 70 in the written test. He shows 1 year of experience as a leadingman and no other creditable experience. Three vouchers show average performance. His personnel jacket shows no penalties.

Subject I: 40 percent \times 70..... 28.00

Subject II:

Step I: Experience rating = 70—52 percent \times 70..... 36.40

Step II: 3 vouchers, at 1.87 each..... 5.60

42.00

Step III: No deduction..... 0

Summation score subject II..... 42.00

Final score..... 70.00

Illustration 2: An applicant obtains a score of 85 in part I of the written test. He shows 4 years experience as a Chief Quarterman, 6 years experience as a quarterman and 6 years experience as a leading man. Vouchers from immediate supervisors show one above average, one average, and one below average. Personnel jacket shows a 2-day deferred suspension 3 years prior to the date of rating.

Subject I: 40 percent \times 85.....	34.00
Subject II:	
Step I: Experience first year as leadingman.....	70
Maximum 10 years bonus:	
10 years as quartermen or higher, at 3.....	30
4 years as Chief Quartermen, at 2.....	8
	<u>108</u>
52 percent \times 108.....	56.16
Step II, 3 vouchers from chart 2.67 1.87 \div 0.....	4.54
	<u>60.70</u>
Step III (2-day suspension) from table 2 \times 2.....	-4.00
Summation score subject 2.....	<u>56.70</u>
Final score.....	<u>90.70</u>

III. CONFIDENTIAL INQUIRY

BOARD OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS, NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD, BROOKLYN 1, N. Y.

CONFIDENTIAL INQUIRY

....., Check No. is an applicant for the position of leadingman Please indicate by checking the appropriate box your opinion of his qualifications for the position applied for:

In forming your opinion, consider such items as:

- (a) Trade knowledge.....
- (b) Ability to deal with others.....
- (c) Knowledge of shipyard rules and regulations.....
- (d) Ability as a leader.....
- (e) Personality.....

Below average ☐ Average ☐ Above average ☐

Signed: Check No.

Rating:

Date:

Please return to: Recorder, Board of United States Civil Service Examiners in the envelope provided.

APPENDIX B.—DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE, BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS,
DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT,
April 28, 1950.

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS, PERSONNEL INSTRUCTION No. 16, SUPPLEMENT No. 1,
AND DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT, PERSONNEL MEMORANDUM No. 74,
SUPPLEMENT No. 1

To: Heads of divisions and chiefs of sections of the Bureau of Accounts in Washington, D. C., for application; and regional disbursing officers for their information and guidance whenever practicable.

Subject: Procedure for selection of supervisory employees.

I. PURPOSE

A. Supervision is one of the keynotes to the success of an organization. To attain good supervision, which in turn helps to bring maximum employee productivity, our efforts must be directed toward selecting the best qualified employees to fill supervisory vacancies, both as they currently occur and on a long-

range basis of planning for future needs. To this end, the Bureau of Accounts is placing into effect a new supervisory selection and training procedure. Normally promotions will be made from within the Bureau organization. If, however, unusual conditions must be met, it may be necessary to make appointments from outside.

B. There are three basic objectives to be gained by this selection method:

1. To constantly improve our supervisory staff;
2. To select the best qualified employees for training and promotion to supervisory positions on a Bureau-wide competitive basis where feasible; and
3. To establish an employee reserve of qualified candidates for future supervisory vacancies by training and trial performance on the job.

II. COVERAGE

A. The application of this memorandum will extend to all divisions and sections of the Bureau of Accounts in Washington, D. C., insofar as is practicable.

B. It is presumed that there will be some positions which cannot feasibly be filled by this procedure in its entirety. Decisions for deviation will be made by the appropriate staff official.

C. Vacancies ordinarily to be filled by this procedure will be for those supervisory positions ranging in grade from GS-5 through GS-12.

D. Regional disbursing officers will be guided by the concepts of this memorandum whenever practicable.

III. BASIC PROVISIONS

A. Part I under this procedure relates to the personnel section's responsibility for development of information on qualifications, conducting interviews and tests, and for making recommendations to the placement committee.

B. Part II relates to the interview of candidates and final recommendation by the placement committee of the Bureau proper or the Division of Disbursement to the Chief Disbursing Officer and/or the Commissioner of Accounts.

C. Part III relates to the long-range program for filling future vacancies.

D. This memorandum is a companion document to the promotion policy release, designated as Personnel Instruction No. 16, and Personnel Memorandum No. 74.

IV. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

Part I. Responsibilities of the personnel officer

A. The Personnel Section will be notified promptly by division and section chiefs of vacancies occurring as soon as the information becomes known or available. Operating officials should also advise as to their future requirements to allow for sufficient planning and training of employees on a long-range basis.

B. The personnel officer will discuss with operating officials the qualifications required for filling each supervisory vacancy; review the classification sheet which describes the duties and responsibilities of the position; determine from Civil Service Commission publications or other standards the formal requirements which must be met; and develop such other information as is deemed essential to establish minimum qualification requirements for the position.

C. Qualified employees in the following categories throughout the Bureau (including the Division of Disbursement) should be considered as prospects:

1. Interested employees in the same grade;
2. Employees in the next grade lower than that of the vacancy regardless of lines of work, who meet minimum requirements for consideration; and
3. Other employees in lower grades who have had (a) previous valuable experience in a similar type of work either in the Bureau or in other agencies, (b) pertinent academic education or (c) other qualifications which would indicate consideration.

D. The division or section chief, where a vacancy exists, will review personnel folders or other appropriate records in collaboration with the personnel officer, to insure that all qualified employees are being considered and to determine those employees who appear to be better qualified and deserving of interview.

E. Employees will be interviewed by the personnel officer to determine:

1. Whether their qualifications officially on record are complete;
2. Their interest in the type of work for which they are being considered; and
3. That their personality, appearance, and manner are satisfactory.

F. Obtain from present and former supervisors of candidates and others in a position to judge, a completed "Confidential Inquiry Form Re Employee Being Considered For Promotion." This form is designed to provide the supervisor's judgment of candidate's job performance, supervisory aptitude, ability, technical knowledge, and capacity for growth. When expeditious action is necessary, similar information may be obtained by telephone, or personal contact with the supervisor in lieu of confidential inquiry form.

G. Conduct written tests. Assemble employees being considered at a time and place scheduled. No one combination of tests will be administered for all supervisory positions. It will be necessary to vary the number and kinds of tests in accordance with the duties, responsibilities, and grades of positions to be filled. However, typical of those that might be expected are the following:

Supervisory-judgment test which measures understanding, interpersonal relationships, and knowledge of personnel practices.

Reading-comprehension test which measures the degree of interpretation of material read.

Supervisory-attitudes test which measures the wholesomeness of attitudes, optimism versus pessimism.

Name and number checking test, which measures ability to absorb and verify detail work, flexibility in shifting from one task to another, speed and accuracy. This test normally will be restricted to clerical supervisory positions in grades GS-5 and GS-6.

Agency organization, personnel, policy test (commonly referred to as AOPP). This test measures the interest employees have in learning on their own initiative facts about the organizational structure, the key personnel, and the major policies of the organization.

Maximum testing time will be approximately 2 hours. Employees need not be tested oftener than once a year, and if a candidate receives consideration for another vacancy within a year, the previous test results usually will suffice.

H. Throughout the development of information, the number of candidates should be narrowed. When placement interviews, testing results, and supervisor's recommendations reveal certain candidates to be less qualified than others, or not interested in the vacant position, the names of such candidates should be eliminated from consideration for the particular vacancy, but candidates will not be excluded from consideration when other vacancies occur.

I. Prepare in chart form for benefit of the placement committee, a final listing of potential prospects in alphabetical order. Factors to be included will be present position, veteran preference, age, education, previous work experience, leave record, efficiency ratings, total Government service and test results.

J. In the event of supervisory vacancies on the accounting system's staff, selection of a replacement will be in accordance with section VI of the accounting program which was promulgated by the Commissioner of Accounts and approved by the Fiscal Assistant Secretary on September 29, 1949. Each candidate will be rated with respect to his qualifications and eligibility in accordance with the minimum requirements which must be met and the standards and specifications as to knowledge and ability which must be demonstrated. In determining the candidate's qualifications and eligibility, the Bureau will seek such expert advice and counsel as it may consider to be in the interest of arriving at an appropriate conclusion, in the light of the specified needs and requirements for the positions to be filled.

Part II. Responsibility of placement committee

A. The placement committee will consist of the following officials:

Bureau proper

1. Deputy Commissioner of Accounts or assistant.
2. Executive assistant to Commissioner.
3. Administrative assistant to Commissioner of Accounts or personnel officer.
4. Chief of division.
5. Supervisor of section having vacancy.

Division of Disbursement

Committees in the Division of Disbursement will be varied depending upon the position to be filled, particularly as between the field and departmental service. Generally, they will be as follows:

For vacancies through grade GS-7:

1. Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer(s).
2. Chiefs of sections.

3. Personnel officer.
For vacancies in grade GS-8 and above:
 1. Assistant Chief Disbursing Officers.
 2. Chief, field supervision.
 3. Personnel officer.
 4. Chief of section when appropriate.
- B. The committee will meet at such times as action is necessary for selection of employees for supervisory vacancies.
- C. Committee members will be provided with:
 1. The chart listing the potential candidates and their qualifications, including test results;
 2. Recommendations of present and former supervisors or others in a position to judge;
 3. A rating form for use in appraising candidates during interviews;
 4. Sample questions which might serve as a guide during interviews; and
 5. If desired, the names of candidates eliminated and reasons therefor.
- D. The Placement Committee will discuss the eligibles in relation to their qualifications shown on the chart, and decide upon the number and order of candidates to be interviewed. (The Personnel Section will make interview arrangements.)
- E. Interviews will be conducted and candidates rated individually by each member on factors of leadership qualities, personality, appearance, and capacity for growth.
- F. Following the interviews, the committee will discuss and reach agreement on the order in which candidates will be recommended for final selection to the Chief Disbursing Officer and/or the Commissioner of Accounts. If all other qualification measurements are equal, seniority preference will prevail. When deemed necessary, final approval will be subject to a satisfactory trial performance. In many types of positions where an employee has not had experience on the exact type of work for which recommended, a trial performance on the job would appear to be desirable.
- G. Upon final approval, the personnel section will place the personnel action into effect.

Part III. Long-range planning for filling future vacancies

- A. Division and section chiefs should periodically review the qualification requirement of the major supervisory positions in their organizations.
- B. Upon informal advice that a vacancy in a key position is apt to occur within a 2-year period from the date of receiving such advice, the division or section chief will notify the personnel officer.
- C. The personnel officer, in cooperation with the division or section chief, will determine the minimum qualification requirements and the minimum time required for on-the-job training.
- D. The selection procedure set forth in parts I and II of this memorandum will be followed through the interview of employees to be considered by the appropriate placement committee.
- E. In lieu of final selection of one candidate for the position in question, the placement committee may recommend more than one candidate for trial performance on the job. In such cases, the personnel officer will plan with the division or section chief the shortest time that evaluation and appraisal of candidates could be determined, and thereafter arrange a detail for each candidate singly to the position in question.
- F. After details of on-the-job performance have been completed by candidates being considered, the division or section chief will make his recommendation of the employee to be selected to the placement committee through the chairman.
- G. Upon decision of final selection of the best qualified employee and at such time as is deemed advisable, the employee to be selected will again be detailed to the position in question to understudy the present incumbent.
- H. No formal personnel action will be effected until the understudy replaces the present incumbent following his separation.

V. EFFECTIVE DATE

This memorandum will be placed into effect immediately.

Any questions, comments or suggestions regarding this release should be referred to the Personnel Section, Attention: Recruitment and Placement.

R. W. MAXWELL,
Commissioner of Accounts.

FORM NO. PS-638

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE—BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS,
PERSONNEL SECTION

CONFIDENTIAL INQUIRY FORM RE EMPLOYEE BEING CONSIDERED FOR PROMOTION

NOTE: Information on job performance and supervisory aptitude and ability is needed in order to rate the candidate named below who is being considered for promotion to a supervisory position. Your cooperation is requested in furnishing detailed information which will assist in making selections. It is essential that, in furnishing this information, it be kept in mind that the position required supervisory responsibility. Outstanding performance as a non-supervisory employee does not guarantee outstanding or even satisfactory performance as a supervisor, because of the difference in duties. If there are any supervisory duties listed below which the employee has not performed, rate him on his aptitude for such. Indicate the basis of ratings in such cases under "Remarks."

Check the answer or answers for each question which describe the candidate and supplement these checks with any examples that you can furnish, or with any other information that will help in the evaluation of the candidate.

Name of candidate----- Name and title of person making this rating-----

Title and duties of position for which candidate is being considered and name of division, section, or subsection in which position is located-----

Special position requirements (if any)-----

1. Has the candidate ever been under your supervision? If so, for what period of time? From----- To-----

2. Position of candidate while under your supervision; please give title and brief description of duties.-----

3. (a) What have been the relations of the candidate with the employees with whom he is or was associated:

☐ Friendly. ☐ Antagonistic. ☐ Leader.
☐ Restrained.

(b) Remarks:

4. (a) Has the candidate supervised other employees? Yes----- No-----
If he has, how would you rate his ability to handle employees?

☐ Excellent leader. ☐ Shy and nonaggressive.
☐ Discipline was poor. ☐ Able.

(b) Remarks:

5. (a) What have been the relations between the candidate and the employees under his supervision?

☐ Liked very much by employees. ☐ Lax in discipline.
☐ Driver. ☐ Strict disciplinarian.
☐ Tries hard but has difficulty getting cooperation.
☐ Employees like his easy-going methods.
☐ Doesn't like to supervise.
☐ Frequent requests for transfers because employees do not respect him.

(b) Remarks:

6. (a) How well does the candidate organize and plan the work of his unit?

☐ His planning makes efficient work possible.
☐ Meets deadlines only by last-minute efforts.
☐ Has trouble meeting deadlines, poor planning.
☐ His employees know what their duties are.

(b) Remarks:

7. (a) How good is he and how much effort does he devote to training and developing his employees?

☐ Pays constant attention to development.
☐ Assists employees in improving performance.
☐ Lets employees train themselves.
☐ Pays little attention to training employees.

(b) Remarks:

8. (a) What is or was the candidate's attitude toward his job while under your supervision?

☐ Shows initiative. ☐ Highly cooperative.
☐ Noncooperative.
☐ Does minimum work. Just enough to get by.

(b) Remarks:

9. (a) How well does the candidate get along with his superior?

- ☐ Responds positively to suggestions ☐ Finds fault
☐ Surly. ☐ Seeks favors.
☐ Cooperative. ☐ Goes off on his own. ☐ Resents suggestions.
☐ Needs close supervision. ☐ Consults with supervisor on important matters.

(b) Remarks:

10. (a) How does the candidate respond to changes in duties, policies, and working conditions?

- ☐ Has no complaints. ☐ Critical. ☐ Objects strongly.
☐ Cooperative.
☐ Resents changes.

(b) Remarks:

11. (a) What is the candidate's attitude toward assuming responsibility?

- ☐ Likes responsibility. ☐ Seeks responsibility.
☐ Avoids responsibility. ☐ Dislikes responsibility.

(b) Remarks:

12. (a) How good is the candidate's technical ability and knowledge of his work?

- ☐ Active in keeping up with latest developments. ☐ Excellent. ☐ Average.
☐ Shows initiative in making improvements. ☐ Sufficient for satisfactory performance.

(b) Remarks:

13. (a) What is the candidate's attitude toward acquiring additional knowledge?

- ☐ Shows initiative in learning immediate section activities.
☐ Unusually interested in learning functions of other sections and divisions.
☐ Interested only in learning requirements of his position.
☐ Lacks interest in learning details of his position.

(b) Remarks:

14. (a) How dependable is the candidate?

- ☐ Can count on him at all times. ☐ Seldom takes leave.
☐ Subject to frequent illness. ☐ Takes leave as fast as it accrues.
☐ Can be assured that assignments will be carried out.

(b) Remarks:

15. Keeping in mind the supervisory and technical requirements of the position for which candidate is being considered, how would you summarize your opinion as to his ability and aptitude for such a position?

After answering the applicable questions above, please sign immediately below and forward this form, sealed in an envelope, to the Personnel Section, Attention: Recruitment and Placement.

Signature of supervisor executing this form: _____ Date: _____

Comments and additional qualifications information obtained by Placement Officers:

APPENDIX C.—DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR BUREAU OF CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROMOTION POLICY FOR BUREAU OF CENSUS

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS PROMOTION PROCEDURE FOR SUPERVISORS GS-5 TO GS-9

Purpose

The purpose of this statement is to outline the procedure of the Bureau of the Census with regard to the promotion from within of qualified employees to supervisory positions.

General promotion policy

The Bureau of the Census is responsible for the collection of reliable statistical data and the furnishing of such data as rapidly as possible to interested Government agencies and other public and private users. These responsibilities can be most effectively fulfilled by employees who are able to find complete job satisfaction through attempts to utilize their skills, capacities, and training to the fullest in the best interest of the organization. In order that all of its employees shall

have an opportunity to develop to their highest potentialities and in order to promote greater efficiency within the Bureau, the Bureau of the Census shall adhere to a firm policy of promotion from within, filling vacancies above the entrance level by reassignment or promotion of the best qualified employees and recruiting candidates from outside only when their qualifications are clearly superior to those possessed by interested and available Census employees. Employees, in turn, have an obligation to prepare themselves by training and self-improvement to accept increased responsibility.

Supervisory selection

As a step toward the implementation of its promotion policy, the Bureau of the Census is hereby inaugurating a formal procedure for the promotion of supervisory personnel. Supervisors constitute the very heart of this organization. Their dual responsibility to management for the interpretation of policies and procedures and the attainment of high standards of work quality and quantity, and to their employees for the maintenance of morale and job satisfaction—doubles the need for the selection of highly qualified personnel. The peculiar nature of the changing programs of the Census Bureau, with its recurrent expansions and reductions in force, further necessitates the selection of supervisors with a broad outlook and generalized experience who can serve the agency wherever their skills may be required. The selection program shall therefore seek candidates possessing the personal and mental qualities required for satisfactory supervisory performance, relegating to secondary importance the attainment of specialized experience in a narrow phase of the agency's program.

Promotion registers

In order to insure the selection of the best qualified available candidate for each supervisory vacancy as it occurs, the Personnel Division shall establish and maintain permanent promotion registers of all candidates for supervisory positions, grades GS-5 through GS-9. The candidates for each grade shall be divided into three broad groups, as follows:

- Group A—Outstanding.
- Group B—Well qualified.
- Group C—Not recommended.

Each of these groups shall be separated into registers representing the several broad types of supervisors which exist in this agency.

The grade level, the group and the registers upon which each candidate is placed shall be determined by the Personnel Division after a careful analysis of his potentialities, experience, training, personality, and other factors, as revealed by a check of his employee record, written tests, performance on a panel interview, and reference interviews with his superiors.

1. *Application.*—All persons wishing to be considered for promotion to a supervisory position GS-5 to GS-9 shall file an application with his division. Such application may be made upon the candidate's own initiative or upon request of his division. Application shall be made for the desired grade and not for a particular register. After the examination process, the applicant shall be placed by the Personnel Division upon the registers for which he may qualify.

A candidate may reapply an indefinite number of times, provided that a period of at least 6 months shall elapse between each accepted application. In exceptional cases and upon approval of the Chief of the Personnel Division, an application may be refiled after only 3 months.

If a candidate's application is not accepted because he fails to meet the minimum qualifications established by the Civil Service Commission for the grade desired, he may submit a new application as soon as he can meet the minimum qualifications.

2. *Employee record check.*—A placement officer shall review the candidate's record before the application is accepted to determine if he meets at least the minimum qualifications for the grade desired, as established by the Civil Service Commission. All employees are responsible for keeping the Personnel Division informed of changes in their qualifications. If the applicant's file is not up to date, he will be requested to submit a current form 57 or other supplementary data.

3. *Written tests.*—Applicants who meet the minimum requirements shall take one or more written tests of the general type indicated in appendix A. To accommodate new and renewed applications, the Personnel Division shall administer tests at least once a month.

Candidates shall be initially placed into group A, B, or C in accordance with the results obtained from the written tests. However, his position may be altered

either upward or downward if the information derived from the panel interview and the reference checks make it advisable.

4. *Panel interview.*—All qualified applicants shall appear before a panel interview consisting of two senior operating officials and one representative of the Personnel Division. Approximately four candidates shall be interviewed by each panel. The panel members shall observe the appearance, manner, poise, speaking ability, attitudes, and general personality of the candidates and their knowledge of management techniques, rather than their subject matter knowledge.

5. *Reference checks.*—A placement officer shall interview at least two superiors of each applicant, guided by a standard interview rating form attached hereto as appendix B. These interviews should reveal the personality factors which directly characterize the candidate's job performance.

Appeals

When an applicant's final position upon the register has been determined by the Personnel Division, the candidate and his division shall be so notified. The Personnel Division may reexamine its decision upon written request of either the applicant or his division within 5 days after the date of notification, supported by a statement indicating that the candidate has been improperly classified. After this review, the Personnel Division may revise its decision, but its decision then becomes final. The candidate's position upon the registers shall thereupon remain unchanged until he reapplies after the stipulated waiting period.

Confidential nature of the examining process

The results of written tests, panel interviews, and reference checks shall be kept confidential and shall not be included in an employee's permanent record.

Selection from the promotion register

When a division has a supervisory vacancy to be filled other than by reassignment of one of its own employees at the same grade, one of the following procedures shall be applied:

1. When the division has a candidate who falls in group A on the promotion register, his promotion shall be approved.

2. When the division's candidate falls in group B, the division must prove that he was improperly classified or that his qualifications for the position are superior to those of any candidate in group A. A decision shall be derived from negotiations between the operating division and the Personnel Division.

3. The promotion of a group C candidate recommended by a division shall not be approved.

4. If the division has no recommendations, a selection shall be made from group A.

The Personnel Division shall remove a candidate's name from the register after his promotion is effected.

Exceptions

All supervisory positions shall be filled in accordance with the above procedure with the following exceptions:

1. Reassignment of another supervisor at the same grade.

2. Promotions from trainee positions clearly labeled in advance. However, no employee shall be placed in a trainee position without the prior approval of the Personnel Division.

3. Reassignments and demotions necessitated by reductions in force or general reorganizations.

4. Reallocations of a position to a higher grade where the incumbent meets the minimum qualifications.

5. Return of employees with reemployment rights or from military service to a position to which he has a right of reemployment or of restoration to duty.

Details and commitments

An employee performing the duties of a supervisory position on a detail basis must be selected in accordance with the procedure outlined herein before he can be promoted to that position. A division may arrange no details or give no commitments or encouragement inconsistent with this procedure.

Recruitments from outside

No employee shall be recruited from outside the Bureau to fill a supervisory position unless his qualifications are unquestionably superior to those of any available, qualified census employee.

Release of employees

A division must release an employee who has been selected for promotion within 30 days after the notice of such selection. Each division is responsible for training replacements for its key positions in order that such release will not unduly interrupt its operations.

Extension of procedure

It is hoped that the promotion procedure outlined herein for supervisory positions may be extended to other groups of census employees in the near future.

APPENDIX D.—DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, BALTIMORE, MD.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Chapter A6—Executive Development and Training.

Personnel Guide 2—Program for selection of potential supervisors in the Division of Accounting Operations.

POLICY OF THE PROGRAM

It is the policy of the Division of Accounting Operations to fill vacancies in first-line supervisory positions only with employees who have been selected through the prescribed selection process, and who have satisfactorily completed the training course designed specifically for these groups.

OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM

The objectives and purpose of this program are—

1. To provide the Division with pools of trained eligibles who can be placed in supervisory vacancies with a minimum of time spent in training on the job.
2. To require consideration of every employee; to insure finding employees who give promise of developing into good supervisors.
3. To provide training for those selected that will give them a foundation on which to build a supervisory career in the Division.
4. To benefit the individual, the employees he will supervise, and the Government, thus assuring the public a greater return for the money it spends.

THE PROGRAM

The program provides for a seven-step method of consideration for selection and a 20-week training course.

The selection process requires (1) recommendation by the immediate supervisor, (2) review and group discussion by the section supervisor with all unit supervisors, (3) review and individual discussion by the branch chief with each section supervisor, (4) employees' written statements, (5) employee participation in general ability and personality tests, (6) interview and recommendation by the recommending panel, and (7) selection by the administrative staff.

The training course is conducted in 2 hour sessions, three times a week, for approximately 20 weeks by officials of the Bureau. Classes will not ordinarily exceed 20 persons.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES

1. *First-line supervisor.*—Upon request by the branch chief, each first-line supervisor of the respective branch will consider all nonsupervisory personnel, grade GS— and above, whom he supervises, with a view toward submitting recommendations for those who he feels possess basic supervisory qualities.

Every supervisor should make a careful evaluation of the potentialities of each member of his staff who is eligible for consideration under this program, and should encourage employees to discuss their eligibility. Each supervisor will prepare a Form 5375 (revised April 1948) Supervisory Aptitude Evaluation Form (see exhibit 1) on each such person—

1. Whose current performance rating is superior in the majority of underlined tasks.
2. Whose performance is adequate and who shows promise for development as a supervisor.

Upon determination of the employees he intends to recommend, the supervisor will interview each person to determine—

1. Whether or not he is interested in becoming a supervisor; and
2. If he will accept assignment on the night shift, if selected.

If the employee is interested, the supervisor will complete a Form 5375 for each person he is nominating, noting on the bottom of the form "will accept night shift," or "will not accept night shift," as the case may be. Where an employee has been under his supervision for less than 90 days, the supervisor will consult the employee's former supervisors who will collaborate with him in completing the Form 5375, indicating on the form the length of supervision by each. Only in exceptional cases will persons who cannot accept night shift be referred for supervisory training. The supervisor will forward all Forms 5375 he has prepared to the section supervisor through supervisory channels.

2. *Intermediate supervisors.*—Upon receipt of the forms, intermediate supervisors will review the recommendations, add written comments and forward the papers to the next line supervisor.

3. *Section supervisor.*—When all evaluation forms have been received, the section supervisor will meet with the unit supervisors in a group to discuss their nominations. After careful review and consideration he will add his written comments to the forms and forward them to the branch chief.

4. *Branch chief.*—As recommendations from sections in his branch are received, the branch chief will meet with each section supervisor individually to discuss his nominations. After a close examination and critical evaluation of all submittals he has received, the branch chief will request employee statements to accompany the recommendations he endorses and forward the statements and recommendations to the Division of Personnel.

Persons not recommended by the branch chief will be so informed by their supervisors who will encourage them to discuss their advancement possibilities, referring them to higher officials for further discussion if advisable.

5. *Personnel office.*—All recommendations will be reviewed and questions resolved with the branch chiefs. Arrangements will be made for the administering of the tests and schedules will be established for interviews by the recommending panel. The personnel office will also arrange for a receptionist for each panel meeting.

GENERAL ABILITY AND PERSONALITY TESTS

General ability and personality tests which have been used quite extensively throughout industry will be administered to all employees recommended by branch chiefs, before they are interviewed by the recommending panel. The bureau test technician, a member of the personnel staff, conducts the tests.

The results of these tests will be used to supplement the supervisory and recommending panel evaluation. They will never be used as a sole basis to justify the inclusion or exclusion of any candidate. After the recommending panel has completed its summary evaluations, the administrative staff will consider the test results—as interpreted by the test technician—with all other pertinent material in making its selections.

THE PANEL INTERVIEW

1. *Purpose and objective.*—The recommending panel conducts the panel interview.

The purpose of the panel interview is to evaluate qualities not measurable by administrative records nor by a review of the supervisors' evaluations or the employee's statement of his qualifications for the position.

The objective of the interview is to determine whether or not, in the judgment of the panel members, the candidates have certain personal qualities to a degree necessary for success in supervisory positions.

Therefore the interviews are concentrated on subjects that will permit the panel members to observe candidates' reactions to verbal situations. And, to insure judgment on the basis of the interview only the panel members are not furnished any information on the candidate prior to the actual interview, other than the candidate's name, grade and assignment.

2. *Organization of the recommending panel.*—The recommending panel is comprised of three branch chiefs and one personnel staff member, appointed by the Chief of Operations of the Division of Accounting Operations. It is the responsi-

bility of this panel to interview all persons recommended by all branch chiefs and to prepare evaluation forms. This panel recommends only—it does not select.

3. *The actual interview.*—Interviews may be conducted in one of two methods—the individual interview in which the candidate is interviewed alone, or the group interview in which three or four candidates are interviewed at one time. The interview session will last approximately 1 hour.

A receptionist will introduce the candidates to the chairman of the panel who in turn will exchange introductions with all present. Every effort will be made to place the interviewees at ease and ample opportunity will be given to candidates to permit them to talk freely and express their own opinions regardless of policies or regulations.

4. *Evaluations of the interviews.*—At the close of each interview, the panel members will prepare two types of evaluation on each candidate—(1) an individual evaluation by each panel member and (2) a composite evaluation representing the panel summary. The four factors on which employees will be evaluated are:

1. Bearing and manner
2. Ability in oral expression
3. Alertness and maturity in thought
4. Ability to inspire confidence

The supervisors' evaluations, the employee's written statement and the personnel folder will be furnished to the panel after completion of the individual evaluation for consideration in arriving at a composite evaluation. Where differences with supervisory evaluations arise and the panel members determine it advisable, the appropriate supervisor will be invited to discuss his evaluations of the employee with the panel.

Upon completion of all interviews and appraisals, the evaluations will be arrayed in quartiles and submitted to the administrative staff.

SELECTION BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

1. *Purpose.*—The administrative staff selects the candidates for participation in the supervisory training course and ultimate assignment in supervisory positions.

2. *Organization.*—The administrative staff is comprised of the Assistant Chief of the Division, all Division branch chiefs, the Bureau test technician, and a representative of the personnel office. The latter two are staff members in the Division of Personnel.

3. *Selection of candidates.*—Upon completion of all summary evaluations the administrative staff will meet to study the evaluations and related information on the recommended candidates. To insure that all employees are given the most careful consideration, the administrative staff will conduct any necessary investigation to reconcile any apparent inconsistencies. After full and complete study, selections will be made and announced. All pertinent papers of successful candidates will be returned to the candidate's supervisor through supervisory channels. Employees selected for the supervisory training course will be notified of the fact by their immediate supervisors.

NONSELECTION BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

The Branch Chief or a person he designates as being the best qualified will discuss with each individual the reasons why he was not selected for supervisory training at this time. In addition to informing the employee of the reason(s) for his nonselection, his opportunities for advancement in nonsupervisory work will be discussed as well as recommendations as to how he can improve so that he may be qualified for supervisory training in the future, if applicable.

SUPERVISORY TRAINING COURSE

Employees selected by the administrative staff for supervisory training will be scheduled to attend the supervisory training course. This course is a series of 2-hour discussions covering policies, regulations, supervisory practices, and orientation with the Federal Security Agency. Each discussion is led by a Bureau specialist in the particular field.

PLACEMENT IN A SUPERVISORY POSITION

First-line supervisory vacancies in the Division will be filled by persons who meet the experience or ability qualifications for the position. Consideration for filling these vacancies will be given to eligibles in the order listed:

1. Employees of the current supervisory staff.
2. Graduates of a supervisory training class who have not yet been placed in a supervisory position.
3. Members of the current supervisory training class.
4. Employees other than those above who possess the special qualifications.

SUPERVISORY APTITUDE EVALUATION FORM

Present position..... Section.....
 Present grade..... Unit.....
 Time in grade.....
 Rating (approximate).....
 Will employee accept night shift? Yes No .

Instructions to rating officer: Based on your knowledge and observation of the employee's work habits, work performance, conduct and personal characteristics, rate as many of the following factors as you can. If you do not feel you are qualified to rate the employee because of the time supervised, consult his previous supervisor.

	Out- stand- ing	Above aver- age	Aver- age	Below aver- age	Unsatis- factory
1. Leave habits and dependability: Is he punctual? Does he abuse sick leave privileges? Does he consider workload in requesting leave? Is he always where he is supposed to be?					
2. Work quality and quantity: Is he industrious? Does he complete assignments rapidly? Is his work accurate? Does he require constant supervision to keep busy? Is his work neat and orderly?					
3. Initiative, resourcefulness and interest: Is he a self-starter? Does he show a desire to learn about other operations? Does he make suggestions to improve his job?					
4. Cooperativeness and teamwork: Does he get along well with fellow employees? Is he willing to do his share of the less desirable work? Does he allow prejudices to mar his relations with other employees? Does he willingly accept assignments outside of his regular duties?					
5. Loyalty to the organization: Is he fair and reasonable in criticism of policies and procedures which affect him? Does he speak well of the organization when occasion arises? Does he complain to other employees about administrative actions and policies?					
6. Willingness to accept responsibility: Does he willingly act as substitute group leader when requested? Does he willingly and satisfactorily train new employees when requested? Does he disclaim responsibility for errors when called to his attention?					
The following items 7 to 14 will also be rated by the panel (on the basis of the interview alone) if the employee is recommended for oral interview. Rate as many of these items as you can, using your best judgment based on knowledge and observation of the employee on the job:					
7. Bearing and manner: Consider his appearance, his poise, his behavior in terms of physical alertness. Is he inoffensively forceful? Is he extremely restless? Is he at ease? Is he likely to be excitable?					
8. Language: Does he express himself adequately? Is his speech and language free from any annoying characteristics? Is he coherent? Does he speak concisely? Does he speak to the point.					
9. Mental alertness, physical vigor: Consider the applicants general mental alertness and physical vigor. Does he accept problems as a challenge? Does he avoid problems? Does he adjust quickly, mentally and physically, to new situations? Is he responsive to problem situations encountered in his work? Does he seem to be in good health? Does he respond to motivation? Does he seem to have plenty of energy?					
10. Understanding of current assignment: Is his knowledge of his current duties and responsibilities merely superficial or memorized? Is he well oriented?—Does he know what is done before and what is done after his operation? Does he know why his duties and responsibilities are assigned to him? Does he show an appreciation of the larger process of which his duties form a part?					
11. Ability to think clearly: Does he recognize the problem? Does he see the implications of the problem as it is presented? Does he resolve a problem into its simpler parts? Does he attempt to develop answers systematically? Does he test tentative solutions to see that they best fit all parts of the problem?					
12. Objectivity: Does he discriminate between fact and opinion in answering questions? Does he bluff in his answers? Is he dogmatic? Does he lean on authority heavily or is he expressing his own opinion?					
13. Tact: Consider the applicant's ability to deal with people diplomatically. Does he inconsiderately interrupt others in conversation? Does he listen with attention and interest? Does he give credit to the views of others?					
14. Supervisory attitudes: Is he basically interested in a technical rather than a supervisory position? Does he recognize the importance in a supervisory position of: leadership? treating employees as individuals? training? handling people? (as contrasted with technical knowledge), teamwork and cooperation? initiative in recognizing and solving problems? planning? evaluating results?					
15. Summary rating: To what extent would you endorse this candidate for a supervisory position? How do you evaluate this employee's qualifications for supervisory work?					

(Name of rating officer)

Remarks.—Explain any of the markings above which you feel to be especially significant. Also explain any pertinent factors which you think are not fully covered.

Comments of Unit Supervisors, Assistant Section Chiefs and Section Chiefs:

SUPERVISORY APTITUDE EVALUATION FORM

Name..... Date.....
 Present position..... Branch.....
 Present grade..... Section.....
 Interviewer..... Shift.....

Briefly characterize the candidate in your own words with respect to the following:

1. Bearing and manner.....
2. Ability in oral expression.....
3. Alertness and maturity in thought.....
4. Ability to inspire confidence.....

Over-all rating: This should be a summary of the candidate. Encircle the number which best indicates your judgment of the candidate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Superior; generally seems to possess the personal characteristics, mental abilities and attitudes which afford an unlimited ceiling for advancement in supervisory work.			Good; has generally favorable personal characteristics, with none that are seriously limiting; observable abilities and attitudes appear to afford a fairly high level of achievement in supervisory work.			Fair; creates a slightly favorable impression but possesses some personal characteristics needing correction or improvement, attitudes and abilities such as to make high level of achievement in supervisory work doubtful.			Poor; possesses certain personal characteristics which leave an unfavorable impression. Observable abilities and attitudes indicate a definite limitation for supervisory work.		

Remarks: Note especially significant reasons for your evaluation of this employee's qualifications for supervisory work. (Use other side, if necessary):

APPENDIX E.—AIR FORCE DIRECTIVES ON SUPERVISORY SELECTION

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
 HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
 Washington 25, D. C., April 30, 1952.

Subject: Amendments to AFM 40-1, Chapter P5.5.

To: All central civilian personnel officers.

Transmitted herewith is a draft copy of a portion of Transmittal Sheet No. 57 to AFM 40-1 to be dated April 28 and to be released officially in the near future. These portions have been duplicated separately and are being distributed directly in draft form to enable field installations to designate a civilian test control officer in accordance with AFR 9-3 and to review implementing instructions on the use of the Air Force Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1) now listed in AFR 9-3, prior to requisitioning of the test materials.

By command of the Chief of Staff:

JACK POCKRASS,
 Chief, Placement and Employee Relations Division,
 Office, Director of Civilian Personnel.

1 Enclosure draft.

5. Designation and functions of civilian test control officers

(a) *Installations.*—A member of each central civilian personnel office will be designated as the civilian test control officer for the installation and serviced activities, for the purpose of centralizing the requisitioning and safeguarding of test materials and related testing program activities. This person normally will be the executive secretary of the Board of Civil Service Examiners, or chief of employee utilization, or the highest ranking placement adviser. The civilian test control officer will be responsible for:

(1) Screening requests for personnel research tests listed in AFR 9-3, and any other tests authorized for use in the Air Force civilian personnel program, prior to submission, to insure that an authorized need exists for the material. The test control officer will certify each request.

(2) Receiving the above test material, assuming personal responsibility for it, insuring safe storage in safes, secure rooms or properly locked cabinets, and controlling the issue to authorized persons only.

(3) Supervising the installation's test administration program; insuring that a qualified test administrator personally supervises the use of test materials during testing sessions or scoring periods; and insuring proper scoring and entry of scores on personnel record cards. Program Supplement No. 11, Test Administrators' Guide, contains guides and information for use of test control officers in performing these functions.

(b) *Major air commands.*—A member of the staff civilian personnel office of each major air command will be designated as the civilian test control officer for the command. The test control officer at command level will serve as an adviser to installation test control officers and will maintain liaison between the Director of Civilian Personnel, Headquarters, USAF, and installations on problems concerning Air Force civilian personnel research and measurement.

* * * * *

12. Use of Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1)

(a) The Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1) is a test battery adapted and validated by the Civilian Personnel Research Branch, Placement and Employee Relations Division, Directorate of Civilian Personnel, Headquarters USAF, from test materials originally developed by the Civil Service Commission.

(b) *Purpose.*—Results of the validation tests (accomplished from data based on actual experimental work with hundreds of Air Force supervisors in clerical, professional, and wage board positions) indicate a strong relationship between high scores on the test battery and successful on-the-job supervisory performance. This series of written tests is considered an effective technique for objective selection of supervisors. Its use is recommended, therefore, to supplement other less objective methods of selection such as evaluation of experience and training; review of the applicant's past history; evaluation of personality and other traits in oral interview; and evaluation of questionnaires and vouchers completed by present and former supervisors. The test battery measures three qualities: (1) supervisory attitudes; (2) supervisory interest; and (3) supervisory judgment. In conjunction with the afore-mentioned techniques of supervisory selection, it will provide objective data on which to base recommendations to management when supervisory jobs are to be filled.

(c) *Positions to which applicable.*—Positions up to and including second-line supervision in clerical fields of work, first-line supervision in professional fields, and up to and including foreman in wage-board fields of work may be filled from this test battery. It was validated upon and is recommended therefore for use in filling supervisory positions involving supervision of at least three employees. It is not required that supervision be the only job element or the most important job element of the position so long as it is an essential element of the position. After the battery has been in use for sufficient time, most first-line supervisors will have been screened by his battery, and little purpose will be served by repeating its administration in selecting for second-line supervisory positions, except where competition is too broad for comparable evaluation of all candidates. Moreover, in selecting for second-line supervisory positions, ordinarily the potential appointees will be persons who have had some opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness of their supervisory abilities in first-line supervisory positions and can be evaluated in terms of actual demonstrated performance.

(d) *Determination of use at installations.*

(1) The test battery is available for use by Air Force installations as they may find most expedient. Administrative decisions regarding the manner in which the test battery is to be used are within the discretion of individual installations, subject to standards which may be issued by respective major air commands. Staff assistance concerning its use may be requested, however, from major air commands or Headquarters USAF at any time.

(2) Decisions to be made before any testing requirement is included in the selection standards for supervisors include the following:

- (a) To what positions and to what levels this program will be applied.
- (b) Whether or not the program will be highly restrictive or flexible in terms of using the resulting roster of eligibles.
- (c) Whether or not competition for supervisory positions will be announced, and if so, how widely and how often it will be announced.
- (d) To what extent employees will be notified of results.
- (e) How extensive competition will be.

It is suggested that civilian personnel office representatives discuss these major administrative decisions with management personnel and employee groups to arrive at solutions which will best implement the usage and acceptance of this test battery in accordance with the installation's promotion policy.

(3) The flexibility of the above procedure will enable installations to adapt the use of this test battery to their needs as they see fit, the only requirement being that the security of the test materials be insured at all times. To this end, the same form of the test will not be administered to any one employee more than once in any 6-month period. If possible, it is recommended that it be administered at an installation not oftener than semiannually.

(e) *Interpretation of scores.*—Interpretation of test scores will be made in terms of job performance from the table of norms shown on the opposite page. The primary determination to be made is whether or not examinees fall above the minimum cut-off score (50) and if they do, in which priority group they fall. As indicated by the interpretation given to the various priority groups (A, B, C), better job performance generally can be expected of persons making higher scores. This interpretation of scores is presented solely as a guide and, in the final analysis, the test score will be interpreted in terms of all other available information about the applicants.

TABLE OF NORMS FOR CIVILIAN SUPERVISORY SELECTION BATTERY (CSSB-1)

Quality of job performance as related to achievement on the civilian supervisory selection battery

Priority group	Converted test score	Interpretation
Ineligible.....	Less than 50.....	Approximately 10 percent of employed supervisors in the experimental sample tested fell below this minimum score either on pt. A, or on the sum of pts. B and C, or on both. Superiors generally rated the supervisors in this group as "showing need for improvement." Examinees falling in this group, in general, will not be considered for selection or promotion to supervisory positions since their probability for success in these positions would be quite low.
O.....	50 to 55.....	The next 45 percent of the supervisors obtained converted scores of 50, or above, on both pt. A and on the sum of pts. B and C, and received a converted score within the range of 50 to 55 on one or the other or both. Superiors generally rated the supervisors in this score range as "typically effective."
B.....	56 to 61.....	The next 40 percent of the supervisors tested obtained converted scores of 56, or above, on both pt. A and on the sum of pts. B and C, and received a converted score within the range of 56 to 61 on one or the other or both. Superiors generally regarded supervisors falling within this range as "very effective."
A.....	62 and above.....	The highest 6 percent of the employed supervisors tested achieved converted scores of 62 or above both on pt. A and on the sum of pts. B and C. These supervisors generally were rated by superiors as "often exceptional."

(f) *Procurement of test materials.*—Test materials may be requisitioned in accordance with AFR 9-3. The following materials are necessary for conducting this examination:

(1) Directions for administering Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1) AF PRT 71.

(2) Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1) AF PRT 72.

(3) USAF civilian personnel standard answer sheet (300-item, five-choice, lettered A through E) AF PRT 73.

(4) Plus scoring key for Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1) (pts. A, B plus, and C plus) AF PRT 74.

(5) Minus scoring key for Civilian Supervisory Selection Battery (CSSB-1) (pts. B minus and C minus) AF PRT 75.

(g) *Record of use.*—Civilian personnel officers using this test battery will keep a narrative account of problems encountered in instituting these tests; the procedures adopted to resolve them; administrative decisions made with respect to the occupations or organizations in which the tests have been used; and an evaluation of their value and acceptance by management and employees. This information will be reported when specific report instructions are issued by the Director of Civilian Personnel, Headquarters, USAF, and will be used in formulating standardized procedures for use of the test battery on an Air Force-wide basis.



